

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

COMPOSITE RESOURCES INC.,

Plaintiff and Counter Defendant,

v.

RECON MEDICAL LLC,

Defendant and Counter Claimant.

Case No. 2:17-cv-01755-MMD-VCF

PERMANENT INJUNCTION ORDER

I. SUMMARY

This is a patent, trademark, and unfair competition case about tourniquets used to stop the flow of blood to a body part when that body part is severely injured. (ECF No. 1.) The jury found Defendant Recon Medical LLC's tourniquets infringe on Plaintiff Composite Resources, Inc. ("CRI")'s asserted patents.¹ (ECF No. 253 (jury verdict).) CRI moves for a permanent injunction preventing Recon from selling its infringing tourniquets. (ECF No. 246 ("Motion").²) Because the applicable factors favor entering a permanent injunction, and as further explained below, the Court will grant the Motion.

111

¹The Asserted Patents are United States Patent No. 7,842,067 (“the ‘067 Patent”), United States Patent No. 7,892,253 (“the ‘253 Patent”), and United States Patent No. 8,888,807 (“the ‘807 Patent”). (ECF No. 171 at 8-9.) CRI owns these three patents. (See *id.*)

²This reference is to a summary of the minutes of the proceedings during which CRI's counsel made an oral motion for entry of a permanent injunction following the conclusion of the jury trial on patent infringement. The Court ordered both parties to file simultaneous post-trial briefs on CRI's motion for a permanent injunction during those same proceedings. (ECF No. 246.) After the parties filed those briefs (ECF Nos. 258, 259), the Court issued a minute order directing the parties to file responses to the arguments raised in the other party's brief. (ECF No. 262.) The parties then timely filed those responsive briefs. (ECF Nos. 263, 264.)

1 **II. BACKGROUND**

2 The Court resolved some of the claims in this case pretrial, the scope of the
3 remaining issues narrowed when Recon filed for bankruptcy and CRI accordingly adjusted
4 its requested remedy as to its remaining claim, and then a jury found in CRI's favor on the
5 key factual question of patent infringement.

6 More specifically, before trial, the Court granted summary judgment to CRI on its
7 trademark infringement and federal unfair competition claims. (ECF No. 152 at 16-23.) As
8 pertinent here, the Court specifically found that Recon infringed CRI's Combat Application
9 Tourniquet mark. (*Id.* at 16-22.) The Court further found Recon had engaged in unfair
10 competition because it used the Combat Application Tourniquet mark, told a prospective
11 customer in an email exchange that Recon's tourniquets were "rebranded" CAT
12 tourniquets with "upgrades," and offered its products in the same three colors that CRI
13 does. (*Id.* at 22-23.)

14 Trial in this case was delayed because of the COVID-19 pandemic. (ECF No. 219
15 at 1.) After Recon filed for bankruptcy several months before trial, CRI obtained an order
16 from the bankruptcy court stating that it could pursue injunctive relief on its patent
17 infringement claims only before this Court, voluntarily dismissed its claim for monetary
18 damages in this Court and stated it had abandoned any intention of filing a proof of claim
19 in the bankruptcy court for monetary damages for patent infringement. (*Id.* at 1-2.) CRI
20 supported that representation with a declaration from its Chief Financial Officer (and later
21 trial witness) Derek G. Thompson. (ECF No. 217-1.) In that declaration, Mr. Thompson
22 stated that he had analyzed the documents Recon filed in bankruptcy court, and based on
23 that analysis, determined Recon could not pay its unsecured creditors including CRI—and
24 the only source of cash it had to pay those creditors would come from selling products that
25 CRI accused of patent infringement. (*Id.* at 3.) Thus, CRI "concluded that, as a practical
26 matter, it effectively has no remedy for damages based upon Recon's patent
27 infringement." (*Id.* at 3-4.)

1 The Court proceeded to hold a jury trial on patent infringement only. (ECF Nos.
2 242, 243, 245.) The jury found that Recon's Gen 1, Gen 2, Gen 3, and Gen 4 tourniquets
3 infringe CRI's asserted patents. (ECF No. 253.) Outside the presence of the jury, and
4 before the jury delivered its verdict, the Court heard argument from both parties under
5 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 50. (ECF No. 245.) The Court granted in part, and denied
6 in part, both parties' motions. (*Id.*) The Court granted Recon's motion "as to claims 15 and
7 16 of the '067 Patent." (*Id.*) The Court granted CRI's motion as to: "(1) [Recon's] invalidity
8 defense and counterclaim for declaratory relief to the extent such a counterclaim is still
9 maintained, finding the three patents at issue to be valid and (2) infringement as to
10 [Recon's] Gen 1, Gen 2 and Gen 3 products." (*Id.*) The Court otherwise denied the
11 motions. (See *id.*)

12 After the jury delivered its verdict, and also outside the presence of the jury, the
13 Court held a hearing on CRI's request for a permanent injunction—the only remedy CRI
14 sought in this Court. (ECF No. 246.) Mr. Thompson and Graham Rogers testified on CRI's
15 behalf; Recon did not put on any witnesses. (See *id.*) CRI's marked trial exhibit P13 was
16 admitted for the purposes of the hearing. (See *id.*) That exhibit is Recon's bankruptcy filing
17 and supporting documents. And that exhibit is the same information that Mr. Thompson
18 explained and analyzed in the declaration described above. (ECF No. 217-1.) As noted,
19 CRI's request for a permanent injunction is the subject of this order.

20 **III. LEGAL STANDARD**

21 Consistent with traditional equitable principles, a patentee seeking a
22 permanent injunction must make a four-part showing: (1) that it has suffered
23 an irreparable injury; (2) that remedies available at law, such as monetary
24 damages, are inadequate to compensate for that injury; (3) that, considering
25 the balance of hardships between the plaintiff and the defendant, a remedy
26 in equity is warranted; and (4) that the public interest would not be disserved
27 by a permanent injunction.

28 *Robert Bosch LLC v. Pylon Mfg. Corp.*, 659 F.3d 1142, 1148 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *eBay*
29 *Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006)).

1 **IV. DISCUSSION**

2 The Court analyzes each of the four applicable factors, in turn, below. However,
 3 before it does, the Court briefly addresses and rejects two arguments Recon raised in its
 4 post-trial briefing that fall outside the four-factor framework. Recon first argued that the
 5 Court should not rule on CRI's Motion until both parties had trial transcripts available to
 6 them. (ECF No. 258 at 6-7.) However, it appears that both parties received any missing
 7 trial transcripts before they filed their responsive briefs (ECF Nos. 263, 264) because both
 8 of those briefs included citations to trial testimony. Thus, the Court rejects that argument
 9 as moot. Second, Recon argues that enjoining it from selling Gen 1, Gen 2, and Gen 3 of
 10 its tourniquets violates the automatic stay imposed by the bankruptcy court. (ECF No. 258
 11 at 21-22.) However, the Court agrees with CRI (ECF No. 264 at 11) that it may enjoin
 12 future acts of infringement, including as to prior generations of Recon's tourniquets. See
 13 *Voice Sys. & Servs., Inc. v. VMX, Inc.*, Case No. 91-C-88-B, 1992 WL 510121, at *10-*11
 14 (N.D. Okla. Nov. 5, 1992) (finding that action seeking "to enjoin post-bankruptcy petition
 15 alleged acts of patent infringement" did not violate an automatic bankruptcy stay).

16 **A. Irreparable Injury**

17 CRI argues it will be irreparably harmed if the Court does not issue an injunction
 18 because CRI and Recon are direct competitors, Recon's products infringe CRI's patents,
 19 and if Recon is allowed to continue selling its infringing products, CRI will be forced to
 20 compete against its own patented inventions—which drive demand for both CRI and
 21 Recon's products. (ECF No. 259 at 4-5.) CRI further argues that CRI's customer base is
 22 diminished each time Recon makes a sale, allowing Recon to continue selling Recon's
 23 tourniquets will harm CRI's reputation, and may encourage others to infringe CRI's
 24 intellectual property. (*Id.* at 6-8.) CRI further notes that it has never licensed its patents
 25 because it seeks to maintain market exclusivity. (*Id.* at 7-8.)

26 Recon counters that CRI did not prove cognizable irreparable harm and failed to
 27 show the requisite causal nexus between the presence of CRI's patented features in
 28

1 Recon's products and demand for Recon's products. (ECF No. 258 at 7-16.) Recon further
2 argues the parties are not competitors. (*Id.* at 16-17.) Overall, the Court agrees with CRI.

3 To start, the Court notes that—contrary to Recon's argument—CRI and Recon are
4 direct competitors. The Court already found as such. (ECF No. 152 at 20.) Indeed, the
5 Court noted it was undisputed that both parties sell their competing products on Amazon's
6 online marketplace. (*Id.*) None of the evidence presented at trial tends to show otherwise.
7 And Recon continued to sell its tourniquets post-trial on Amazon at a discount. (ECF No.
8 259-2.) The Court accordingly rejects Recon's unpersuasive argument that it does not
9 compete with CRI.

10 To the extent that Recon is arguing CRI did not sufficiently show that CRI lost sales
11 to Recon because of Recon's infringing sales instead of sales by some other potential
12 infringer, the “fact that other infringers may be in the marketplace does not negate
13 irreparable harm.” *Robert Bosch*, 659 F.3d at 1151 (citation omitted). And especially
14 considering the Court's pretrial findings that Recon offers its tourniquets in the same colors
15 as CRI and encouraged actual confusion in at least one instance (ECF No. 152 at 22-23),
16 CRI made a sufficiently cognizable showing of irreparable harm. Mr. Thompson and Mr.
17 Rogers also testified both at trial and during the permanent injunction hearing that CRI
18 competed against Recon. While perhaps they did not put on as detailed a substitution or
19 lost profits analysis as they could have, they certainly reasonably suggested that sales of
20 Recon's infringing products would cause CRI to lose sales.

21 In addition, Recon's argument that CRI did not sufficiently show irreparable harm
22 by showing that its infringing sales take away from CRI's sales does not directly contradict
23 another argument CRI makes in support of its Motion—that CRI will be irreparably harmed
24 if an injunction does not issue because it would effectively be required to compete against
25 its own patented invention. (ECF No. 259 at 4-5.) “Where two companies are in
26 competition against one another, the patentee suffers the harm—often irreparable—of
27 being forced to compete against products that incorporate and infringe its own patented
28

1 inventions.” *Douglas Dynamics, LLC v. Buyers Prod. Co.*, 717 F.3d 1336, 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2
 2 2013).³ Because the jury found infringement here, there is no longer any dispute—Recon’s 3
 3 tourniquets incorporate CRI’s patented inventions. And while *Douglas Dynamics* 4
 4 contained the caveat “[e]ven absent consumer confusion[,]” see *id.* at 1344, here, the 5
 5 Court found actual consumer confusion (ECF No. 152 at 16-23). Thus, CRI was not 6
 6 required to present extensive analysis as to whether Recon’s products are a perfect 7
 7 substitute for CRI’s to show it would be irreparably harmed were Recon allowed to 8
 8 continue infringing. Recon is selling a very similar product that a jury found to infringe 9
 9 CRI’s asserted patents through at least one overlapping sales channel.

10 *Douglas Dynamics* also supports CRI’s request for a permanent injunction in at 11
 11 least two other ways as well. First, there, like here, the plaintiff did not license its intellectual 12
 12 property. (ECF No. 259 at 7-8.) The Federal Circuit Court of Appeals found that fact 13
 13 weighed in favor of finding irreparable harm because “[e]xclusivity is closely related to the 14
 14 fundamental nature of patents as property rights.” *Douglas Dynamics*, 717 F.3d at 1345. 15
 15 Furthermore, CRI’s “reputation would be damaged if its dealers and distributors believed 16
 16 it did not enforce its intellectual property rights.” *Id.* Similarly, here, the Court could be seen 17
 17 as sanctioning potential infringement by others if it does not enjoin Recon. CRI would be 18
 18 irreparably harmed if forced to continue to compete against Recon’s infringing products.

19 That brings the Court to causal nexus. Contrary to Recon’s argument, the Court 20
 20 finds a sufficient causal nexus exists here. To start, Recon’s causal nexus argument relies 21
 21 on *Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 695 F.3d 1370, 1374-75 (Fed. Cir. 2012). (ECF No. 22
 22

23 ³Recon attempts to distinguish *Douglas Dynamics* by arguing that CRI is not an 24
 24 innovator like the plaintiff in that case. (ECF No. 258 at 9-10.) While there is some merit 25
 25 to this argument, the Court nonetheless finds it unpersuasive. While CRI did not itself 26
 26 invent the inventions embodied in the asserted patents, it purchased them from the 27
 27 inventor Mark Esposito, who testified on CRI’s behalf at trial. CRI owns the asserted 28
 28 patents, the Court found them valid, and the jury found them infringed. Because the
 29
 29
 30
 30
 31
 31
 32
 32
 33
 33
 34
 34
 35
 35
 36
 36
 37
 37
 38
 38
 39
 39
 40
 40
 41
 41
 42
 42
 43
 43
 44
 44
 45
 45
 46
 46
 47
 47
 48
 48
 49
 49
 50
 50
 51
 51
 52
 52
 53
 53
 54
 54
 55
 55
 56
 56
 57
 57
 58
 58
 59
 59
 60
 60
 61
 61
 62
 62
 63
 63
 64
 64
 65
 65
 66
 66
 67
 67
 68
 68
 69
 69
 70
 70
 71
 71
 72
 72
 73
 73
 74
 74
 75
 75
 76
 76
 77
 77
 78
 78
 79
 79
 80
 80
 81
 81
 82
 82
 83
 83
 84
 84
 85
 85
 86
 86
 87
 87
 88
 88
 89
 89
 90
 90
 91
 91
 92
 92
 93
 93
 94
 94
 95
 95
 96
 96
 97
 97
 98
 98
 99
 99
 100
 100
 101
 101
 102
 102
 103
 103
 104
 104
 105
 105
 106
 106
 107
 107
 108
 108
 109
 109
 110
 110
 111
 111
 112
 112
 113
 113
 114
 114
 115
 115
 116
 116
 117
 117
 118
 118
 119
 119
 120
 120
 121
 121
 122
 122
 123
 123
 124
 124
 125
 125
 126
 126
 127
 127
 128
 128
 129
 129
 130
 130
 131
 131
 132
 132
 133
 133
 134
 134
 135
 135
 136
 136
 137
 137
 138
 138
 139
 139
 140
 140
 141
 141
 142
 142
 143
 143
 144
 144
 145
 145
 146
 146
 147
 147
 148
 148
 149
 149
 150
 150
 151
 151
 152
 152
 153
 153
 154
 154
 155
 155
 156
 156
 157
 157
 158
 158
 159
 159
 160
 160
 161
 161
 162
 162
 163
 163
 164
 164
 165
 165
 166
 166
 167
 167
 168
 168
 169
 169
 170
 170
 171
 171
 172
 172
 173
 173
 174
 174
 175
 175
 176
 176
 177
 177
 178
 178
 179
 179
 180
 180
 181
 181
 182
 182
 183
 183
 184
 184
 185
 185
 186
 186
 187
 187
 188
 188
 189
 189
 190
 190
 191
 191
 192
 192
 193
 193
 194
 194
 195
 195
 196
 196
 197
 197
 198
 198
 199
 199
 200
 200
 201
 201
 202
 202
 203
 203
 204
 204
 205
 205
 206
 206
 207
 207
 208
 208
 209
 209
 210
 210
 211
 211
 212
 212
 213
 213
 214
 214
 215
 215
 216
 216
 217
 217
 218
 218
 219
 219
 220
 220
 221
 221
 222
 222
 223
 223
 224
 224
 225
 225
 226
 226
 227
 227
 228
 228
 229
 229
 230
 230
 231
 231
 232
 232
 233
 233
 234
 234
 235
 235
 236
 236
 237
 237
 238
 238
 239
 239
 240
 240
 241
 241
 242
 242
 243
 243
 244
 244
 245
 245
 246
 246
 247
 247
 248
 248
 249
 249
 250
 250
 251
 251
 252
 252
 253
 253
 254
 254
 255
 255
 256
 256
 257
 257
 258
 258
 259
 259
 260
 260
 261
 261
 262
 262
 263
 263
 264
 264
 265
 265
 266
 266
 267
 267
 268
 268
 269
 269
 270
 270
 271
 271
 272
 272
 273
 273
 274
 274
 275
 275
 276
 276
 277
 277
 278
 278
 279
 279
 280
 280
 281
 281
 282
 282
 283
 283
 284
 284
 285
 285
 286
 286
 287
 287
 288
 288
 289
 289
 290
 290
 291
 291
 292
 292
 293
 293
 294
 294
 295
 295
 296
 296
 297
 297
 298
 298
 299
 299
 300
 300
 301
 301
 302
 302
 303
 303
 304
 304
 305
 305
 306
 306
 307
 307
 308
 308
 309
 309
 310
 310
 311
 311
 312
 312
 313
 313
 314
 314
 315
 315
 316
 316
 317
 317
 318
 318
 319
 319
 320
 320
 321
 321
 322
 322
 323
 323
 324
 324
 325
 325
 326
 326
 327
 327
 328
 328
 329
 329
 330
 330
 331
 331
 332
 332
 333
 333
 334
 334
 335
 335
 336
 336
 337
 337
 338
 338
 339
 339
 340
 340
 341
 341
 342
 342
 343
 343
 344
 344
 345
 345
 346
 346
 347
 347
 348
 348
 349
 349
 350
 350
 351
 351
 352
 352
 353
 353
 354
 354
 355
 355
 356
 356
 357
 357
 358
 358
 359
 359
 360
 360
 361
 361
 362
 362
 363
 363
 364
 364
 365
 365
 366
 366
 367
 367
 368
 368
 369
 369
 370
 370
 371
 371
 372
 372
 373
 373
 374
 374
 375
 375
 376
 376
 377
 377
 378
 378
 379
 379
 380
 380
 381
 381
 382
 382
 383
 383
 384
 384
 385
 385
 386
 386
 387
 387
 388
 388
 389
 389
 390
 390
 391
 391
 392
 392
 393
 393
 394
 394
 395
 395
 396
 396
 397
 397
 398
 398
 399
 399
 400
 400
 401
 401
 402
 402
 403
 403
 404
 404
 405
 405
 406
 406
 407
 407
 408
 408
 409
 409
 410
 410
 411
 411
 412
 412
 413
 413
 414
 414
 415
 415
 416
 416
 417
 417
 418
 418
 419
 419
 420
 420
 421
 421
 422
 422
 423
 423
 424
 424
 425
 425
 426
 426
 427
 427
 428
 428
 429
 429
 430
 430
 431
 431
 432
 432
 433
 433
 434
 434
 435
 435
 436
 436
 437
 437
 438
 438
 439
 439
 440
 440
 441
 441
 442
 442
 443
 443
 444
 444
 445
 445
 446
 446
 447
 447
 448
 448
 449
 449
 450
 450
 451
 451
 452
 452
 453
 453
 454
 454
 455
 455
 456
 456
 457
 457
 458
 458
 459
 459
 460
 460
 461
 461
 462
 462
 463
 463
 464
 464
 465
 465
 466
 466
 467
 467
 468
 468
 469
 469
 470
 470
 471
 471
 472
 472
 473
 473
 474
 474
 475
 475
 476
 476
 477
 477
 478
 478
 479
 479
 480
 480
 481
 481
 482
 482
 483
 483
 484
 484
 485
 485
 486
 486
 487
 487
 488
 488
 489
 489
 490
 490
 491
 491
 492
 492
 493
 493
 494
 494
 495
 495
 496
 496
 497
 497
 498
 498
 499
 499
 500
 500
 501
 501
 502
 502
 503
 503
 504
 504
 505
 505
 506
 506
 507
 507
 508
 508
 509
 509
 510
 510
 511
 511
 512
 512
 513
 513
 514
 514
 515
 515
 516
 516
 517
 517
 518
 518
 519
 519
 520
 520
 521
 521
 522
 522
 523
 523
 524
 524
 525
 525
 526
 526
 527
 527
 528
 528
 529
 529
 530
 530
 531
 531
 532
 532
 533
 533
 534
 534
 535
 535
 536
 536
 537
 537
 538
 538
 539
 539
 540
 540
 541
 541
 542
 542
 543
 543
 544
 544
 545
 545
 546
 546
 547
 547
 548
 548
 549
 549
 550
 550
 551
 551
 552
 552
 553
 553
 554
 554
 555
 555
 556
 556
 557
 557
 558
 558
 559
 559
 560
 560
 561
 561
 562
 562
 563
 563
 564
 564
 565
 565
 566
 566
 567
 567
 568
 568
 569
 569
 570
 570
 571
 571
 572
 572
 573
 573
 574
 574
 575
 575
 576
 576
 577
 577
 578
 578
 579
 579
 580
 580
 581
 581
 582
 582
 583
 583
 584
 584
 585
 585
 586
 586
 587
 587
 588
 588
 589
 589
 590
 590
 591
 591
 592
 592
 593
 593
 594
 594
 595
 595
 596
 596
 597
 597
 598
 598
 599
 599
 600
 600
 601
 601
 602
 602
 603
 603
 604
 604
 605
 605
 606
 606
 607
 607
 608
 608
 609
 609
 610
 610
 611
 611
 612
 612
 613
 613
 614
 614
 615
 615
 616
 616
 617
 617
 618
 618
 619
 619
 620
 620
 621
 621
 622
 622
 623
 623
 624
 624
 625
 625
 626
 626
 627
 627
 628
 628
 629
 629
 630
 630
 631
 631
 632
 632
 633
 633
 634
 634
 635
 635
 636
 636
 637
 637
 638
 638
 639
 639
 640
 640
 641
 641
 642
 642
 643
 643
 644
 644
 645
 645
 646
 646
 647
 647
 648
 648
 649
 649
 650
 650
 651
 651
 652
 652
 653
 653
 654
 654
 655
 655
 656
 656
 657
 657
 658
 658
 659
 659
 660
 660
 661
 661
 662
 662
 663
 663
 664
 664
 665
 665
 666
 666
 667
 667
 668
 668
 669
 669
 670
 670
 671
 671
 672
 672
 673
 673
 674
 674
 675
 675
 676
 676
 677
 677
 678
 678
 679
 679
 680
 680
 681
 681
 682
 682
 683
 683
 684
 684
 685
 685
 686
 686
 687
 687
 688
 688
 689
 689
 690
 690
 691
 691
 692
 692
 693
 693
 694
 694
 695
 695
 696
 696
 697
 697
 698
 698
 699
 699
 700
 700
 701
 701
 702
 702
 703
 703
 704
 704
 705
 705
 706
 706
 707
 707
 708
 708
 709
 709
 710
 710
 711
 711
 712
 712
 713
 713
 714
 714
 715
 715
 716
 716
 717
 717
 718
 718
 719
 719
 720
 720
 721
 721
 722
 722
 723
 723
 724
 724
 725
 725
 726
 726
 727
 727
 728
 728
 729
 729
 730
 730
 731
 731
 732
 732
 733
 733
 734
 734
 735
 735
 736
 736
 737
 737
 738
 738
 739
 739
 740
 740
 741
 741
 742
 742
 743
 743
 744
 744
 745
 745
 746
 746
 747
 747
 748
 748
 749
 749
 750
 750
 751
 751
 752
 752
 753
 753
 754
 754
 755
 755
 756
 756
 757
 757
 758
 758
 759
 759
 760
 760
 761
 761
 762
 762
 763
 763
 764
 764
 765
 765
 766
 766
 767
 767
 768
 768
 769
 769
 770
 770
 771
 771
 772
 772
 773
 773
 774
 774
 775
 775
 776
 776
 777
 777
 778

1 258 at 10.) However, it is unclear to the Court that this is that type of case—“where the
2 accused product includes many features of which only one (or a small minority) infringe[.]”
3 *Apple*, 695 F.3d at 1374. Compared to the smartphones at issue in *Apple* the tourniquets
4 at issue in this case do not include many features. See *Janssen Prod., L.P. v. Lupin Ltd.*,
5 109 F. Supp. 3d 650, 700 (D.N.J. 2014), *later modified to permit settlement*, Case No. 10-
6 5954 (WHW), 2016 WL 1029269 (D.N.J. Mar. 15, 2016) (“First, this case is unlike
7 the *Apple* cases because it does not involve “complex, multi-featured” products.”). And the
8 jury’s infringement verdict certainly does not suggest that only a small minority of the
9 features of Recon’s tourniquet infringe—the jury found that all four generations of Recon’s
10 tourniquets infringe. (ECF No. 253.) Thus, the Court questions how applicable *Apple* is to
11 this case.

12 But even assuming *Apple* provides the causal nexus standard, the Court finds that
13 CRI has sufficiently satisfied the causal nexus requirement. “The relevant question is not
14 whether there is some causal relationship between the asserted injury and the infringing
15 conduct, but to what extent the harm resulting from selling the accused product can be
16 ascribed to the infringement.” *Apple*, 695 F.3d at 1375. Recon argues CRI has not satisfied
17 this standard because Recon’s CEO, Derek Parsons, testified at trial that people buy
18 Recon’s tourniquets because of unpatented features unique to Recon’s tourniquets,
19 specifically a finger hole, an aluminum instead of plastic windlass, and an integrated pen.
20 (ECF No. 258 at 10-11.) However, in this very same portion of Recon’s brief, Recon also
21 attributes Recon’s sales to the fact that its tourniquets ‘work very well’ and are less
22 expensive than CRI’s. (*Id.*) Again given the jury’s infringement finding, the fact that
23 Recon’s tourniquets ‘work very well’ is actually evidence of the causal nexus between the
24 harm caused by Recon’s infringing tourniquet sales and key features of the asserted
25 patents. Generally speaking, and as Mr. Esposito testified at trial, the asserted patent
26 claims cover core features of both CRI and Recon’s products, namely tourniquets having
27 an inner and outer strap that apply even circumferential pressure due to that design and
28

1 can be tightened down with only one hand because of the windlass. (ECF No. 264 at 4.)
 2 Similarly, the fact that consumers allegedly purchase Recon's tourniquets because they
 3 are cheaper than CRI's could show that consumers want CRI's patented features for a
 4 cheaper price just as easily as it could show that consumers want Recon's tourniquets for
 5 the finger hole or other features. Thus, portions of Recon's causal nexus argument
 6 undermine its overall causal nexus argument.

7 Recon's argument also ignores two key elements of Mr. Parsons' testimony. First,
 8 Mr. Parsons repeatedly described the features Recon now describes as unpatented in its
 9 briefing as patented at trial, even though he admitted upon questioning from the Court at
 10 one point in his testimony that Recon only had a design patent for the ornamental finger
 11 hole and otherwise had some pending applications—not patents. Second, Mr. Parsons
 12 extensively testified that he did not believe his tourniquets infringed the asserted patents.
 13 In finding infringement, the jury implicitly rejected Mr. Parsons' testimony regarding
 14 noninfringement as not credible. And this ties back to the first element of Mr. Parsons'
 15 testimony—about 'patented' features—because that testimony was not credible either.
 16 Even after admitting that the features he was attributing consumer demand to were not
 17 patented, he continued to describe them as such.⁴

18 Moreover, and as CRI points out in reply, there was other testimony from other
 19 witnesses affirmatively tending to show that demand for both CRI and Recon's products
 20 is driven by demand for patented features. Most notably, that testimony came from the
 21 inventor listed on the asserted patents, Mr. Esposito, who explained why the tourniquets
 22 he created 'work really well' (like Recon's). (ECF No. 264 at 4 (citing trial testimony).)

23
 24 ⁴The Court recognizes from the jury verdict in CRI's favor that the jury found Mr.
 25 Parsons not credible and therefore analyzes Recon's argument consistent with that
 26 implicit finding on the jury's part. See, e.g., *Teutscher v. Woodson*, 835 F.3d 936, 944 (9th
 27 Cir. 2016) ("[I]n a case where legal claims are tried by a jury and equitable claims are tried
 28 by a judge, and those claims are based on the same facts, the trial judge must follow the
 jury's implicit or explicit factual determinations in deciding the equitable claims.") (internal
 quotation marks, punctuation, and citations omitted). Said otherwise, Recon's argument
 about a purported lack of causal nexus is primarily unpersuasive because it is based on—
 and to some extent contradicted by—the unreliable testimony of Mr. Parsons.

1 Unlike prior art tourniquets, the tourniquets reflected in the asserted patents can be
2 operated with one hand, and the two-strap design applies more consistent and therefore
3 less painful or injurious pressure to cut off the flow of blood to the injured body part. (*Id.*)
4 These features are captured in the asserted patents, and again, the jury found that
5 Recon's tourniquets infringed the asserted patents. (*Id.*; see also ECF No. 253.) Thus,
6 Recon's argument that people buy its tourniquets because they 'work really well' and are
7 cheaper than CRI's is more persuasive than its argument that people buy them for the
8 finger hole, aluminum windlass, or pen. And all of this shows the requisite causal nexus.

9 For all of these reasons, the Court finds that CRI will be irreparably harmed if the
10 Court does not issue a permanent injunction here.

11 **B. Inadequacy of Monetary Damages**

12 Moving to the second prong of the permanent injunction analysis, CRI argues it
13 lacks an adequate remedy at law because the documents filed in Recon's bankruptcy case
14 indicate Recon has no ability to pay CRI damages, particularly considering that Recon's
15 bankruptcy plan contemplates paying creditors through continued infringement. (ECF No.
16 259 at 9-12.) CRI further argues that it would be difficult to quantify the loss of market
17 share, goodwill, and brand recognition caused by Recon's infringement, and CRI has
18 never licensed its patents—and does not intend to—so damages would not be an
19 adequate substitute for an injunction. (*Id.* at 12-13.) Recon counters that CRI chose not to
20 pursue monetary damages, so it cannot show it lacks an adequate remedy at law. (ECF
21 No. 258 at 17-19.) The Court again agrees with CRI, though again finds some merit to
22 Recon's argument.

23 Recon's argument is somewhat meritorious because there is no doubt CRI chose
24 not to pursue monetary damages—and that makes this case somewhat unusual.
25 However, Recon's argument on this point is ultimately unpersuasive both because it
26 seems to assume CRI faced unconstrained choices and ignores the contents of its own
27 bankruptcy filings. Said otherwise, Recon selectively ignores why CRI chose not to seek
28

1 monetary damages. As CRI argues (ECF No. 264 at 10-11), CRI's decision not to seek
2 monetary damages was forced by Recon's decision to file bankruptcy. CRI basically faced
3 a Hobson's choice: either abandon this case altogether after years of litigation or get an
4 order from the bankruptcy court that would only allow it to pursue injunctive relief in this
5 Court because there was no question it could no longer seek monetary damages in this
6 case. It is simply unreasonable for Recon to suggest that CRI should lose its ability to
7 pursue injunctive relief here because Recon filed for bankruptcy.

8 Moreover, both the declaration of Mr. Thompson (ECF No. 217-1) and trial exhibit
9 P13 illustrate another key reason why CRI chose not to pursue monetary damages against
10 Recon: Recon is unable to pay damages, particularly considering that its restructuring plan
11 contemplates continuing to infringe CRI's patents in order to pay its bills. If, as indicated
12 by Mr. Thompson's declaration and trial exhibit P13, Recon is unable to pay damages to
13 CRI, the Court cannot see how CRI has an adequate remedy at law. Recon's inability to
14 pay instead points towards the only adequate remedy being a permanent injunction. Cf.
15 *Robert Bosch*, 659 F.3d at 1154-55 (finding that inability to pay tends to support an
16 irreparable harm finding). Moreover, CRI's contention that it never licenses its patents is
17 unrebutted, and that too tends to support a finding that any remedy at law would not
18 adequately compensate CRI for Recon's infringement. See *Douglas Dynamics*, 717 F.3d
19 at 1344-45 (finding that the plaintiff's decision not to license its patents contributed to the
20 plaintiff's showing of reputational harm, and later finding, in turn, that the reputational harm
21 the plaintiff had shown contributed to a finding that the plaintiff lacked an adequate remedy
22 at law).

23 In sum, while Recon's argument on inadequate remedy at law is clever, the Court
24 need not abandon all common sense. Recon cannot pay CRI damages and continues to
25 infringe CRI's patents as it awaits this order. (ECF No. 259-2.) CRI does not have an
26 adequate remedy at law. This factor also weighs in favor of granting a permanent
27 injunction.

28

C. Balance of Hardships

2 Turning to the third prong, CRI argues that the balance of hardships tips in its favor
3 because it further developed the patented inventions invented by Mark Esposito and
4 invested in domestic manufacturing facilities to produce its tourniquets, whereas Recon
5 simply copied CRI's tourniquets and had them inexpensively produced abroad, giving
6 Recon a cost advantage. (ECF No. 259 at 13-14.) Recon counters that the balance of
7 hardships tips in its favor because there is no evidence that Recon's infringement caused
8 any hardship for CRI, and issuing an injunction will harm Recon—specifically, prohibiting
9 Recon from selling its infringing tourniquets will make Recon's business untenable and
10 force it to lay off its employees. (ECF No. 258 at 19-20.) The Court again ultimately agrees
11 with CRI though it again finds Recon's argument somewhat persuasive.

12 Entering an injunction here will work a hardship on Recon because it may have to
13 cease operations and lay off its employees. However, both the Court’s Rule 50 ruling and
14 the jury’s verdict indicate that Recon’s entire tourniquet business is based on
15 infringement—and has been since Mr. Parsons started Recon by selling “off-the-shelf”
16 tourniquets that he purchased from a foreign manufacturer. The Court’s Rule 50 finding
17 on validity also indicates that Mr. Esposito actually invented something that deserves the
18 exclusivity CRI seeks here. Even though entering a permanent injunction will work a
19 hardship on Recon, the balance of hardships nonetheless favors CRI because CRI is—
20 and has been for nearly five years now—attempting to assert its valid patent right of
21 exclusivity against Recon while Recon infringes CRI’s patents, trademark, and competes
22 unfairly against CRI. See, e.g., *Voice Sys. & Servs., Inc.*, 1992 WL 510121, at *9 (“The
23 balance of hardships tips in favor of VMX, who has developed patentable innovations, and
24 who has invested in substantial research and development, rather than VSSI, who has
25 built its business by infringing VMX’s patents.”); *SATA GmbH & Co. KG v. USA Italco Int’l*
26 *Ltd.*, Case No. 3:18-cv-00351-MMD-WGC, 2019 WL 4601513, at *6 (D. Nev. Sept. 20,
27 2019) (“Without an injunction, SATA will continue to be harmed because Defendants are

1 likely to continue to infringe on SATA's marks and designs.").⁵ Overall, this third prong of
 2 the analysis also favors issuing a permanent injunction.

3 **D. Public Interest**

4 CRI finally argues that the public interest favors issuing an injunction because
 5 public policy favors protection of the rights secured by valid patents. (ECF No. 259 at 14-
 6 15.) Recon counters that the public interest would be served if it were allowed to continue
 7 selling its infringing tourniquets because they have been involved in saving lives, and CRI
 8 failed to offer evidence that it could satisfy the demand for tourniquets sold by Recon if
 9 Recon was forced to remove its tourniquets from the marketplace. (ECF No. 258 at 20-
 10 21.) Like the other three factors, the Court again agrees with CRI.

11 “[T]he public often benefits from healthy competition. However, the public generally
 12 does not benefit when that competition comes at the expense of a patentee's investment-
 13 backed property right.” *Apple*, 809 F.3d at 647. Again, Recon's Gen 1, Gen 2, Gen 3, and
 14 Gen 4 tourniquets infringe CRI's valid patents. (ECF Nos. 253, 255.) Recon engaged in
 15 unfair competition with CRI and infringed CRI's trademark. (ECF No. 152 at 16-23.) Here,
 16 the public interest prong weighs in favor of granting CRI a permanent injunction because
 17 Recon's unfair competition comes at the expense of CRI's investment-backed property
 18 rights.

19 In sum, because all four factors weigh in favor of granting CRI a permanent
 20 injunction, the Court grants the Motion. Recon is hereby permanently enjoined as
 21 specifically described below in Section V.

22 **V. CONCLUSION**

23 The Court notes that the parties made several arguments and cited to several cases
 24 not discussed above. The Court has reviewed these arguments and cases and determines
 25
 26

27 ⁵This second citation is more pertinent to the Court's prior trademark infringement
 28 finding in this case.

1 that they do not warrant discussion as they do not affect the outcome of the Motion before
2 the Court.

3 It is therefore ordered that CRI's motion for a permanent injunction is granted.

4 It is further ordered that Recon Medical, LLC, and its past, present, or future
5 officers, agents, affiliates, vendors, suppliers, consultants, advisors, distributors, sales
6 representatives, licensees, servants, employees, confederates, attorneys, manufacturers,
7 successors, assigns, and any persons acting in concert or participation with any of them
8 are hereby permanently enjoined and restrained as follows:

- 9 1. Recon Medical, LLC and all others bound by this injunction shall not use, promote,
10 advertise, market, monetize, sell, offer for sale, distribute, transfer, manufacture,
11 have made, take a license or assignment in, or license or offer for license its Gen
12 1, Gen 2, Gen 3, or Gen 4 products, regardless of name or designation used in
13 connection with such tourniquets or products.
- 14 2. Recon Medical, LLC and all others bound by this injunction shall immediately and
15 permanently remove its Gen 1, Gen 2, Gen 3, and Gen 4 products, regardless of
16 name or designation used in connection with such tourniquets or products, from
17 any and all websites and online marketplaces, including but not limited to
18 Amazon.com and www.recommedical.com.
- 19 3. Recon Medical, LLC and all others bound by this injunction are hereby enjoined
20 from importing Gen 1, Gen 2, Gen 3, and Gen 4 tourniquets into the United States,
21 regardless of name or designation used in connection with such tourniquets or
22 products.

23 The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

24 DATED THIS 6th Day of January 2022.

25
26
27 
28 MIRANDA M. DU
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE